



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/395,455	09/14/1999	ANDREW SARKISIAN	199-1135	6058

7590 02/27/2002

ROBERT P RENKE  
LYON & ARTZ PLC  
28333 TELEGRAPH ROAD  
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034

EXAMINER

BACHNER, REBECCA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2163

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Offic Acti n Summary**

Application No.	SARKISIAN ET AL.
09/395,455	
Examiner Rebecca M Bachner	Art Unit 2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Peri d f r Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 1999.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disp sition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**D tail d Action**

This is a first office action on the merit. Claims 1-33 are pending.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 13-16, 18, 20-21, 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frost.

*EWS*

As per claim 1, Frost discloses a method of developing product characteristics for a new product comprising the steps of: generating a plurality of product attributes (see column 3, lines 19-45, a plurality of product attributes are generated);

classifying each of said attributes (see column 4, lines 34-53, the final attributes are classified into groups);

generating a preferred product brand position as a function of said product attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a preferred product brand position is generated by the attributes); and

generating target product characteristics as a function of said classified product attributes and said preferred product brand position, said target product characteristics representing customer-driven objectives for each of said plurality of product attributes

Art Unit: 2163

(see column 3, lines 34-45, and column 6, lines 45-54, the product's characteristics are a function of its attributes and preferred brand, the characteristics represent customer-driven objectives for a plurality of product attributes).

As per claim 2, Frost discloses all the limitations of a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the step of generating a plurality of product attributes comprises the steps of providing a plurality of summary attributes and a clarifying definition for each of said summary attributes, said clarifying definition providing a relationship between each of said product attributes and the type of product under development (see column 3, lines 35-45, and column 7, lines 29-54, there are a plurality of product attributes, the product attributes have a relationship with every product under development, attributes are used to describe characteristics of a product).

As per claim 3, Frost discloses all the limitations of a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the step of generating a plurality of product attributes includes the step of providing a detailed definition for each of said product attributes, each of said detailed definitions providing a context for each attribute as it relates to the product under development (see column 3, lines 34-45, the attributes are divided into two categories: rational descriptors, emotional descriptors which include stereotypes and personality, these attributes are used to describe the product under development).

As per claim 5, Frost discloses all the limitations of a method as recited in claim 1 further comprising the step of ranking each of said product attributes (see column 4, lines 45-48, the attributes are ranked by showing preference for certain attributes).

As per claim 7, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 1 further comprising the step of generating a primary brand position as a function of said product attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a primary brand position is generated by the product attributes).

As per claim 8, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 1 further comprising the step of generating a present product brand position as a function of said product attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a product brand position is generated by the product attributes).

As per claim 13, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method of developing product characteristics for a new automotive vehicle comprising the steps of: generating a plurality of vehicle attributes, said plurality including at least attributes from each of the following groups of vehicle characteristics: usage experience, driving experience, and design (see column 3, lines 19-45, a plurality of product attributes are generated); generating a preferred vehicle brand position as a function of said vehicle attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a preferred product brand position is generated by the attributes); and

generating target vehicle characteristics as a function of said vehicle attributes and said preferred vehicle brand position, said target vehicle characteristics representing customer-driven objectives for each of said plurality of vehicle attributes (see column 3, lines 34-45, and column 6, lines 45-54, the product's characteristics are a function of its attributes and preferred brand, the characteristics represent customer-driven objectives for a plurality of product attributes).

As per claim 14, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 13 wherein the step of generating a plurality of vehicle attributes comprises the steps of providing a plurality of summary attributes and a clarifying definition for each of said summary attributes said clarifying definition providing further detail relating each of said vehicle attributes to a vehicle characteristic (see column 3, lines 35-45, and column 7, lines 29-54, there are a plurality of attributes, vehicle attributes are used to describe characteristics of a vehicle).

As per claim 15, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 13 wherein the step of generating a plurality of vehicle attributes includes the step of providing a detailed definition for each of said vehicle attributes each of said detailed definitions providing a context for each attribute as it relates to the vehicle under development (see column 3, lines 34-45, the attributes are divided into two categories: rational descriptors, emotional descriptors which include stereotypes and personality, these attributes are used to describe the vehicle under development).

As per claim 16, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 13 further comprising the step of classifying each of said vehicle attributes (see column 4, lines 34-53, the attributes are classified into groups).

As per claim 18, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 13 further comprising the step of ranking each of said vehicle attributes (see column 4, lines 45-48, the attributes are ranked by the user by showing preference for certain attributes).

As per claim 20, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 13 further comprising the step of generating a primary brand position as a function of said vehicle attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a primary brand position is generated by the attributes).

As per claim 21, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 13 further comprising the step of generating a present product brand position as a function of said vehicle attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a product brand position is generated by the attributes).

As per claim 28, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method of developing product characteristics for a new automotive vehicle comprising the steps of:

generating a plurality of vehicle attributes, said plurality including at least attributes from each of the following groups of vehicle characteristics: usage experience, driving experience, and design (see column 3, lines 19-45, a plurality of vehicle attributes are generated);

providing target customer characteristics (see column 3, lines 35-45, the customer provides characteristics of the vehicle);

providing target vehicle image characteristics (see column 3, lines 35-45, the customer also provides vehicle image characteristics in terms of both physical and emotional descriptors); thereafter

generating a preferred vehicle brand position as a function of said vehicle attributes, said target customer characteristics, and said target vehicle image characteristics (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a preferred product brand position is generated by the attributes); and

generating target vehicle objectives as a function of said vehicle attributes and said preferred vehicle brand position, said target vehicle objectives representing customer-driven and image-driven characteristics for each of said plurality of vehicle attributes (see column 3, lines 34-45, and column 6, lines 45-54, the product's characteristics are a function of its attributes and preferred brand, the characteristics represent customer-driven objectives for a plurality of product attributes).

As per claim 29, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 28 wherein the step of providing target customer characteristics comprises the

step of providing a brand positioning summary (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, the product attributes are given by the customer, they are the characteristics that the customer associates with a particular brand).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 6, 9-12, 17, 19, 22-27, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost.

As per claim 4, Frost discloses all the limitations of a method as recited in claim 1 and the step of classifying attributes and using attributes to represent different characteristics of the product (see column 3, lines 35-45, the attributes about the product are from the two different groups: rational descriptors and emotional descriptors, which include stereotype and personality descriptors, a primary brand position is generated by the product attributes). However, Frost does not explicitly teach placing the attribute in one of three classes wherein said first class represents attributes which differentiate the product from competing products, said second class represents important attributes, but which do not differentiate the new product from competing products, and said third class represents otherwise desirable product attributes. It would

be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create classes that represent the different attributes in the above manner as it explicitly separates the product, based on its attributes, from its competitors. At the time that the present invention was made, it would have been obvious to create different classes for the project as it allows one to easily find the attributes that differentiate this product from its competitors. By allowing the important differentiating attributes to be easily seen, the product marketers and manufacturers can more accurately determine their market segment and how their product is perceived against the competition.

As per claim 6, Frost discloses the limitations of the method as recited in claim 4 further comprising the step of ranking each of said product attributes (see column 4, lines 45-48, the vehicle attributes are ranked by the user by showing a degree of preference with the attributes for the vehicle). Frost does not explicitly teach that the rank is related to each of the classes such that each of the attributes in the first class have a higher rank than each of the attributes in the second class and each of the attributes in the second class have a higher rank than each of the attributes in the third class. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the ranking be related to the classes so that the attributes in each class have a higher ranking than the class before as it is a more efficient and user-friendly way to separate the classes. By separating the classes based on rank, a user can quickly find the most important and distinguishable attributes in a single class. At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious for one to group in this way as many things are grouped based on

rank. For example, schools are grouped based on their rank. In the same way, the schools with higher attribute ratings (or higher rank) all fall into a higher tier (or class) when compared to other schools.

As per claim 9, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the step of generating a preferred product brand position as a function of said product attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a primary brand position is generated by the product attributes). However, Frost does not explicitly teach associating each of said product attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set. It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to associate the product attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to the competitive set as it explicitly separates the product from its competitors. As the time the present invention was made, it would have been obvious to associate the product attributes with a competitive level as it allows one to easily identify the attributes that differentiate this product from its competitors. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done this as it allows the important differentiating attributes to easily be seen, the product marketers and manufacturers can more accurately determine their market how their product is perceived, and what makes their product unique from its competition.

As per claim 10, Frost discloses the limitations of the method as recited in claim 9. Frost does not explicitly teach associating each of the product attributes with one of the four competitive levels wherein the step of associating each of said product

attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set includes the step of prioritizing each product attribute in one of four levels, said first level representing a desire for the product attribute to be a leader (L) with respect to the competitive set, said second level representing a desire for the product attribute to be among the leaders (A) with respect to the competitive set, said third level representing a desire for the product attribute to be competitive (C) with respect to the competitive set, and said fourth level representing a desire for the product attribute to be minimally competitive (M) with respect to the competitive set. It is well known in the art to associate a product attribute with a competitive level. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the different levels of competitiveness of the product in order to determine and prioritize the product's attributes. By placing the attributes in different competitive levels, one is better able to determine the advantages of their product and apply them to a specified market segment. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to create the levels to categorize the attributes as it is a user-friendly way to visualize the advantages as well as an accurate way to compare the product with its competition.

As per claim 11, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 7 wherein the step of generating a primary product brand position as a function of said product attributes includes the steps of identifying a competitive set of products (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a primary brand position is generated by the product attributes). However, Frost does not explicitly teach

associating each of said product attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set. It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to associate the product attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to the competitive set as it explicitly separates the product from its competitors. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to associate the product attributes with a competitive level as it allows one to easily identify the attributes that differentiate this product from its competitors. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done this as it allows the important differentiating attributes to be easily seen. Therefore, the product marketers and manufacturers can more accurately determine their market how their product is perceived, and what makes their product unique from its competition.

As per claim 12, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 11. Frost does not explicitly teach the step of associating each of said product attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set includes the step of prioritizing each product attribute in one of four levels, said first level representing a desire for the product attribute to be a leader (L) with respect to the competitive set, said second level representing a desire for the product attribute to be among the leaders (A) with respect to the competitive set, said third level representing a desire for the product attribute to be competitive (C) with respect to the competitive set, and said fourth level representing a desire for the product attribute to be minimally competitive (M) with respect to the competitive set. It is well known in the art to associate a product attribute with a competitive level. It would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to create the different levels of competitiveness of the product in order to determine and prioritize the product's attributes. By placing the attributes in different competitive levels, one is better able to determine the advantages of their product and apply them to a specified market segment. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to create the levels to categorize the attributes as it is a user-friendly way to visualize the advantages as well as an accurate way to compare the product with its competition.

As per claim 17, Frost discloses all the limitations of a method as recited in claim 16 and the step of classifying vehicle attributes and using the attributes to represent different characteristics of the vehicle (see column 3, lines 35-45, the attributes of the product are from the two different groups: rational descriptors and emotional descriptors, which include stereotype and personality descriptors). However, Frost does not explicitly teach placing the vehicle attribute in one of three classes wherein said first class represents attributes which differentiate the vehicle from competing vehicles, said second class represents important vehicle attributes, but which do not differentiate the new vehicle from competing vehicles, and said third class represents otherwise desirable vehicle attributes. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create classes that represent the different vehicle attributes in the above manner as it explicitly separates the vehicle, based on its attributes, from its competitors. At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to create different classes for the vehicle as it allows one to easily identify the attributes that differentiate it from its

Art Unit: 2163

competitors. By allowing the important differentiating attributes to be easily seen, the vehicle marketers and manufacturers can more accurately determine their market segment and how their vehicle is perceived against the competition.

As per claim 19, Frost discloses the limitations of the method as recited in claim 17 further comprising the step of ranking each of said vehicle attributes (see column 4, lines 45-48, the vehicle attributes are ranked by the user by showing a degree of preference with the attributes for the vehicle). Frost does not explicitly teach that the rank is related to each of the classes such that each of the vehicle in the first class have a higher rank than each of the vehicle attributes in the second class and each of the attributes in the second class have a higher rank than each of the vehicle attributes in the third class. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the ranking be related to the classes. This is a more efficient and user-friendly way to separate the classes as it allows the vehicle attributes in each class have a higher ranking than the previous class. By separating the classes based on rank, a user can quickly find the most important and distinguishable attributes in a single class. At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious for one to group attributes in this way as many things are grouped based on rank. For example, schools are grouped based on their rank. In the same way, the schools with higher attribute ratings (or higher rank) all fall into a higher tier (or class) when compared to other schools.

As per claim 22, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 13 wherein the step of generating a preferred vehicle brand position as a function of said vehicle attributes includes the steps of identifying a competitive set of vehicles. However, Frost does not explicitly teach associating each of said vehicle attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set. It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to associate the vehicle attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to the competitive set as it explicitly separates the vehicle from its competitors. At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to associate the vehicle attributes with a competitive level as it allows one to easily identify the attributes that differentiate this product from its competitors. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done this as it allows the important differentiating attributes to be easily seen. Therefore, the vehicle marketers and manufacturers can more accurately determine how their vehicle is perceived, and what makes their vehicle unique against the competition.

As per claim 23, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 22. Frost does not explicitly teach the step of associating each of said vehicle attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set includes the step of prioritizing each vehicle attribute in one of four levels, said first level representing a desire for the vehicle attribute to be a leader (L) with respect to the competitive set, said second level representing a desire for the vehicle attribute to be among the leaders (A) with respect to the competitive set, said third level representing a

Art Unit: 2163

desire for the vehicle attribute to be competitive (C) with respect to the competitive set, and said fourth level representing a desire for the vehicle attribute to be minimally competitive (M) with respect to the competitive set. It is well known in the art to associate a product attribute with a competitive level. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the different levels of competitiveness of the product in order to determine and prioritize the product's attributes. By placing the attributes in different competitive levels, one is better able to determine the advantages of their product and apply them to a specified market segment. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to create the levels to categorize the attributes as it is a user-friendly way to visualize the advantages as well as an accurate way to compare the product with its competition.

As per claim 24, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 20 wherein the step of generating a primary brand position as a function of said vehicle attributes (see column 3, lines 44-45, and column 8, lines 11-25, a primary brand position is generated by the product attributes). However, Frost does not explicitly teach associating each of said vehicle attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set. It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to associate the vehicle attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to the competitive set as it explicitly separates the product from its competitors. At the time the present invention was made, associating the product attributes with a competitive level allows one to easily identify the vehicle attributes that differentiate this

product from its competitors. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done this as it allows the important differentiating vehicle attributes to be easily seen. Therefore, the vehicle marketers and manufacturers can more accurately determine their market how their product is perceived, and what makes their product unique from its competition.

As per claim 25, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 24. Frost does not explicitly disclose the step of associating each of said vehicle attributes with a preferred competitive level with respect to said competitive set includes the step of prioritizing each vehicle attribute in one of four levels, said first level representing a desire for the vehicle attribute to be a leader (L) with respect to the competitive set, said second level representing a desire for the vehicle attribute to be among the leaders (A) with respect to the competitive set, said third level representing a desire for the vehicle attribute to be competitive (C) with respect to the competitive set, and said fourth level representing a desire for the vehicle attribute to be minimally competitive (M) with respect to the competitive set. It is well known in the art to associate a product attribute with a competitive level. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the different levels of competitiveness of the product in order to determine and prioritize the product's attributes. By placing the attributes in different competitive levels, one is better able to determine the advantages of their product and apply them to a specified market segment. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to create the levels to categorize the attributes as it is

a user-friendly way to visualize the advantages as well as an accurate way to compare the product with its competition.

As per claim 26, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 16 wherein the step of classifying each of said attributes (see column 3, lines 35-45, the attributes about the product are from the two different groups: rational descriptors and emotional descriptors, which include stereotype and personality descriptors). However, Frost does not classify design attributes differently than usage experience attributes and driving experience attributes. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to classify design attributes differently than usage and driving attributes as design attributes pertain to the way a person sees and feels about the non-functional aspects of the car, while usage and driving refer to the mechanical aspects of the car. At the time the invention was made, separating these two important attribute categories allows the vehicle marketers and manufacturers to more accurately determine what improvements they need to make on the car. This also allows the functional aspects to be evaluated independently of the appearance.

As per claim 27, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 26 wherein the step of classifying each of said attributes includes the step of classifying each design attribute using a scale (see column 4, lines 45-48, the vehicle attributes are ranked by the user by showing a degree of preference with the attributes for the vehicle). Frost did not disclose a scale having more gradients than the

classification scale for classifying usage experience attributes or driving experience attributes. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a scale with more gradients for the usage and driving experience attributes as it would more accurately allow the vehicle manufacturers and marketers to determine successful and unsuccessful characteristics of the vehicle. Using a scale with gradients, also emphasizes the more important attributes. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to use gradients as it increases the accuracy of the scale for the usage and driving attributes.

As per claim 32, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 28. Frost does not teach of the step of providing a cross-functional product team and wherein said cross-functional product team is responsible for the steps of generating a preferred vehicle brand position and generating target vehicle objectives. It is well known in the art to create teams for marketing purposes that generate brands and objectives for a particular product. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to have a cross-functional product team as it allows people from various groups in the company to combine expertise in producing the vehicle. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have a cross-functional product team as it uses expertise from all areas of the company.

As per claim 33, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 32. Frost does not teach of a cross-functional product team that includes at least

one member from each of the following corporate departments: vehicle program management, marketing, purchasing, finance, engineering, and design. It is well known in the art to create teams for marketing purposes. These teams would include people from the vehicle program management, marketing, purchasing, finance, engineering, and design. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to have all these different types of people on a cross-functional product team as it allows people from the various groups in the company to combine expertise in producing the vehicle. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have a cross-functional product team as it uses expertise from all areas of the company.

5. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost in further view of McCarthy et al.

As per claim 30, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 29. Frost discloses target customer defining characteristics (see column 3, lines 35-45, the customer provides characteristics of the vehicle). Frost does not explicitly teach of a brand-positioning summary. McCarthy explicitly teaches of a brand positioning summary which includes target customer defining characteristics, target customer selection rationales, a summary of the new vehicles' role in the product portfolio, a competitive assessment, enduring reasons why a customer may purchase the new vehicle, and pricing considerations (see chapter 3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create a brand positioning summary, as customer

characteristics, customer selection rationales, product portfolio, competitive assessment, purchase reasons, and pricing considerations are all common features of determining how and if a product should be marketed to the public. One of ordinary skill in the art would have included a brand-positioning summary as it allows a company to identify their market. At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to include a brand position summary as it summarizes all of the important characteristics of the product including its most important attributes. This allows someone to quickly and accurately determine the type of product and the market segment.

As per claim 31, Frost discloses all the limitations of the method as recited in claim 28 and the step of providing target vehicle image characteristics. However, Frost does not teach the step of providing a brand bulls eye. McCarthy et al. teaches placing data characteristics in a bulls eye formation (see page 47). It would be obvious for one skilled in the art to place the brand information in a bulls eye format as it a common format for depicting information pictorially. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one to use the bulls eye to show brand information as it is a user-friendly format and clearly emphasizes important vehicle image characteristics.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Moulson (P.N. 5991734) discusses a method for measuring the creative value added to a communication.

Taylor et al. (P.N. 6070149) discusses a method and system that offers a user ideas goods and services from a parameters collected from the user.

Tuzhilin (P.N. 6236978) discuss a system and method for generating a user profile based on both a static and a dynamic profile of the user.

Young et al. (P.N. 6322368) discuss an apparatus and method for training and testing human judgment using user rankings, and scores.

Goldberg, Aaron in the article "From Prospect to Sale" in Marketing Computers, discusses marketing using attributes, classifications and ranking.

Higgins, Kevin in the article "The Value of Customer Value Analysis" in Marketing Research discusses grouping attributes and market strategies.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rebecca Bachner whose telephone number is 703-305-1872. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 8:00am to 4:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 703-305-9643.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703-746-7238 [After Final Communication]

703-746-7239 [Official Communications]

703-746-7240 [For status inquiries, draft communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

RMB  
February 20, 2002



ERIC W. STAMBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100